UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/865,773	05/25/2001	Aruna Rohra Suda	4233-4002	5757

27123 7590 05/18/2007	EXAMINER	
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P. 3 WORLD FINANCIAL CENTER NEW YORK, NY 10281-2101	CHANNAVAJJALA, SRIRAMA T	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2166	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/18/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _12 March 2007_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1,4,6-10,12-15,18-21,26-50,52-57,59-61,63-64,66-67,69,72-73,75-79,93-94,96-97,99-103_ is/are pending in the application.

  4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _See Continuation Sheet_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

  a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

    1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

    2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

    3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _1/12/2007_.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____ .

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims rejected are 1,4,6-10,12-15,18-21,26-50,52-57,59-61,63,64,66,67,69,72,73,75-79,93,94,96,97 and 99-103.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   Claims *1,4,6-10,12-15,18-21,26-50,52-57,59-61,63-64,66-67,69,72-73,75-79,93-94,96-97,99-103* are pending in this application.

2.   Examiner acknowledges applicant's amendment filed on 3/12/2007.

3.   Claims 1,4,12,13,14,26-27,28,30-31,40,44,49-50,54-57,59,60,63-64,72,77,93,94,96-97,99, have been amended [3/12/2007].

4.   Claims 100-103 have been added [3/12/2007].

5.   Claims 1,27-28,30-31,40,44,49,59-60,80,93 have been amended [11/2/2006].

6.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/02/2006 has been entered, and a non-final Office action is as follows

7.   Claims 1,12,47-49,59,60,62,69,87,93,94 have been amended [Suppmental amendment filed on 5/11/2006]

8.   Claims 5,11,16-17,22-25,51,58,65,68,70,74,86,88-91,95,98 have been cancelled [Suppmental amendment filed on 5/11/2006]

9.   Examiner considered applicant's both supplemental amendment and amendment filed on 3/27/2006, 5/11/2006.

10.   In view of the appeal Brief filed on 7/7/2005, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY

REOPENED, and non-final action was mailed on 01/18/2006

11.   In view of applicant's response to notification of non-complaint appeal brief filed

on 07 July 2005, examiner hereby withdrawn "Final-Office action" mailed on

11/22/2004.

12.   Claims 1-15,18-57,59-93 are pending in this application.

13.   Claims 16-17,58 are cancelled, see paper filed on 6/15/2004

14.   Claims 80-93 have been added, see paper filed on 6/15/2004

15.   In view of the applicant proper number form of the claims, the claim objections

set forth in the previous office action is hereby withdrawn.

Drawings

16.   Examiner acknowledges applicant substituted drawings

fig: 6,10,24,35,31,32,34,35,37-41,85,89 <u>acceptable</u> for examination purpose,

filed on 6/15/2004.

Priority

17.   Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an

application Serial No. 2000-197293, 2000-248999, 2000-314601, filed in JAPAN on

5/29/2000, 7/7/2000,10/16/2000 respectively. Examiner acknowledges applicant

submitted **_certified copy_** of the 2000-197293, 2000-248999, 2000-314601 applications

as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

Information Disclosure Statement

18.   The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on **1/12/2007** is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner, a copy of PTO-1448 is enclosed with this office action.

19.   The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on **11/2/2006 and 7/27/2006** is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner, a copy of PTO-1448 was enclosed with previous office action.

20.   The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on **03/27/2006** is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner, a copy of PTO-1448 was enclosed with previous office action.

21.   The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on **03/08/2005** is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner, a copy of PTO-1448 was enclosed with previous office action.

22.   The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on **9/25/2001**, paper no. # 3; **4/11/2002**, paper no. # 4; 12/8/2003, paper no. # 5; **8/28/2003**, paper no. # 6 respectively acknowledged. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37

CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner, a copy of PTO-1448 is enclosed with previous office action, paper no. # 7.

Double Patenting

23.   The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

24. *Claims 1-4,6-10,12-15,18-21,26-50,52-57,59-64,66-67,69,71-73,75-85,87,92-*

94,96-97,99 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of

obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-58 of co

pending Application No. 09/938,866, filed on 8/24/2001, claims 1-42 of application

10/116,932 filed on 4/5/2002, claims 1-37 of application 10/117,514 filed on

4/5/2002, 1-51 of application 10/387,002 filed on 3/12/2003, 1-42 of application

10/387,005 filed on 3/12/2003 .

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in

The referenced copending applications and would be covered by any patent granted on

that copending applications since the referenced copending applications and the instant

applications are claiming similar, common subject matter. Although the conflicting

claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because in the

present application Independent Claims 1,59-60,80,93 are directed to data processing

system setting means for setting a condition for web page...data acquisition means for

acquiring web page data; determination means for determining whether the acquired

web page data....indexing means for assigning a predetermined index to web page

data....saving means for saving the web page data....[claim 1,59-60,93], extracting data

within a predetermined meta tag ...displaying, when the retrieved web page.... [claim

80] ; while co-pending Application No. **09/938,866**, independent Claims 1,24 are

directed to a data processing apparatus comprising means for initiating saving....saving

one of either an internet page content displayed ....URL of the page; means for

acquiring....initiating saving;, means for indexing......predetermined index to

data....means for data saving acquired data....predetermined storage unit.

Co-pending application no. *10/116,932* independent claims 1,34-42 directed to

information processing system ....receiving means for receiving information....internet;

transmission means....client terminals, ...server information.....display means for

displaying.....

Co-pending application no. *10/117,514* independent claims 1,19,37 directed to

information processing....information obtaining means for obtaining information;

template selection means.....extraction means for extracting data....saving means for

saving data.....

Co-pending application no. *10/387,002* independent claims 1,36,43,46-47,50-51

directed to information processing method ....obtaining a processing instruction from a

displayed web page, transferring the ......processing instruction.

Co-pending application no. *10/387,005* independent claims 1,27,38-42 directed to a

data processing method comprising...obtaining data displayed by a browser, importing

data without displaying the data, storing and managing the obtained data.......

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of data processing at

the time the invention was made to modify the cited steps as indicated copending

09/938,866, independent Claims 1,24 , application*10/116,932* independent claims 1,34-

42, *10/117,514* independent claims 1,19,37, *10/387,002* independent claims

1,36,43,46-47,50-51, *10/387,005* independent claims 1,27,38-42, since the omission

and addition of the cited limitations would have not changed the process according to

which the data processing web page related data, particularly would perform the same

function of managing web page related data . In re Karlson, 136 USPQ 184 (CCPA

1963). Accordingly, the instant Claims are broad and within the scope of the Claims of

copending applications.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the

conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of

the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g)

prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

25.   *Claims 1-4,6-8,13-15,18-21,26-39,59-64,66-67,69,71,78-79, 93-94,96-97,*

99-103 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barrera

et al. [hereafter Barrera], US Patent No. 6567800 filed on Oct 1, 1998 and

published on May 20,2003 in view of Cole et al. [hereafter Cole], US Patent No.

5933827 published on Aug3, 1999.

26.   As to Claims 1,59-60,93, Barrera teaches a system which including

'saving web page data [col 4, line 56-57],

'data acquisition means for acquiring web page data browsed by a browser client'

[col 4, line 26-30], Barrera specifically teaches Vspider return information related to web

page particularly textual content, page size, data and other related web page

information that corresponds to acquiring web page data'

'keyword extraction means for extracting a keyword from a content of the

acquired web page data' [col 4, line 26-30, line 56-62], Barrera specifically teaches

extracting textual content, from the web page or website particularly content is

correlated with a category i.e., keywords as detailed in col 4, line 56-62];

'indexing means for assigning a plurality of indices that include a first index

unique to the acquired web page data and a second index comprising the extracted

keyword to the acquired web page data' [col 5, line 1-4, line 17-19], Barrera specifically

suggests categories are listed for example search by subject corresponds to indexing

information related to keywords from the web page , further Barrera also suggests

dynamic index is stored that including list of web pages or URLs as detailed in col 5,

line 17-19; first index unique to the acquired web page data and a second index

corresponds to Barrera's categories and sub-categories because each category is

uniquely identifies information for example see fig 1, element 101;

determination means for determining whether the condition is satisfied for saving

the acquired web page data' [col 5, line 17-19], Barrera specifically suggests "dynamic

index is stored that including list of identifiers or URLs as detailed in col 5, line 17-19;

'saving means for saving the acquired web page data in correspondence with the

assigned indices [fig 5]in a predetermined database, the saved web page data being

sufficient to regenerate at least a portion o a previously browed web page without

accessing to the original source' [col 5, line 25-26, one 38-42], Barrera specifically

suggests metatags in the web pages provide specific category or categories related to

website identifiers sufficient to display content from the file or site.

It is however, noted that Barrera does not specifically teach, "newly browses the

web page data", although Barrera does teach web page data acquiring as detailed in

col 4, line 26-30. On the other hand, Cole specifically teaches "newly browses the web

page data" [col 6, line 36-40, line 46-48, line 61-67, col 7, line 1-2, fig 3, fig 8], newly

browses the web page data corresponds to Cole's categories containing new entries as

detailed in fig 3,8.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of

applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of system for identifying new web

pages of interest to a user of Cole et al. into system and method for searching

information stored on a network of Barrera et al. because both Barrera, Cole are

specifically directed to searching and arranging web pages [see Barrera: Abstract, fig 6;

Cole: Abstract], both Barrera and Cole specifically teaches categories and sub-

categories [see Barrera: fig 1,col 1, line 46-48; Cole: col 3, line 54-57] and both

specifically teach search engines particularly Yahoo [Barrera: fig 1; Cole: col 3, line 55-

56] and both Barrera and Cole are same field of endeavor.

one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to

incorporate the teachings of system for identifying new web paes of interest to a user of

Cole et al. into system and method for searching information stored on a network of

Barrera et al. because that would have allowed users of Barrera to incorporate profile

building function that specifically includes hot links of related category of each of the

new web page data, further indicates the source of the request and it is also noted that

client always makes a request for "what is new" that allows uses to fetch all the new

data entries for those categories from the database as suggested by Cole [col 6, line

23-40, fig 3] bringing the advantages of users can order a list of recently added web

pages of interest [Cole: col 2, line 50-55].

27.   As to claim 4, 64, Barrera disclosed sorting means for sorting indices of the data

in the database [col 2, line 66-67, col 3, line 1], categorizing most relevant information

as detailed in col 3, line 1;;

'display means for displaying a result of the sorting by said sorting means'

[fig 8, col 5, line 4-5].

28.   As to claim 6,66, Barrera disclosed 'selecting means for selecting an index from the indices displayed on said display means' [fig 8-9], Barrera specifically teaches displaying various categories for selection as detailed in fig 8;

'retrieval means for retrieving data corresponding to the index selected by said selecting means from the database' [col 5, line 5-8], Barrera specifically teaches retrieving content or data within the specific category.

29.   As to claims 7,67, Barrera disclosed 'deleting means for deleting at least one index from the indices displayed on said display means' [col 5, line 25-26

'removal means for removing data corresponding to the index deleted by said deleting means from the database' [col 5, line 25-26]., Barrera specifically suggested "dynamic index" which is a real-time indexing that including of websites in the category and subcategories.

30.   As to claim 8, Barrera disclosed 'wherein at least one of the data has a plurality of values for an index, and said sorting means places the plurality of values at positions corresponding to respective values' [col 2, line 27-30, fig 4].

31.   As to claim 13, Barrera disclosed 'indexing means acquires a URL of the data from the browser as the second index' [col 5, line 17-19].

32.   As to claim 14, Barrera disclosed 'indexing means acquires a title embedded in the data from the browser as the second index' [col 5, line 19-25].

33.   As to claim 15, Barrera disclosed 'each group corresponds to a network session' [col 1, line 10-14].

34.   As to claim 18, Barrera disclosed 'word assigning means for assigning a word specified by a user as a further index to the data to be saved by said saving means' [col 2, line 26-29].

35.   As to claim 19-20, Barrera disclosed 'wherein if an index assigned to the data to be saved has been assigned to other data, said saving means saves the data as a new data or updates the other data according to a setting by the user' [col 5, line 17-19].

36.   As to claim 21, Barrera disclosed 'comparing means for comparing the effective period with a current time at a predetermined timing' [col 4, line 25-28]

        'removal means for removing data in correspondence with the effective period before the current time based upon the result of a comparison by said comparing means' [col 5, line 11-16].

37.   As to claim 26, Barrera disclosed 'saving means saves the browsed data in a first

save mode and saves a URL for the browsed data in place of the browsed data in a

second save mode' [col 3, line 58-62].

38.   As to claim 27, Barrera disclosed 'further comprising setting means for setting

whether or not data linked to the browsed data is to be saved with the browsed data'

[col 4, line 13-15].

39.   As to claim 28, Barrera disclosed 'further comprising said setting means for

setting to save all the browsed data without any instruction for each of the browsed data

by the user' [col 4, line 4-6].

40.   As to claim 29, Barrera disclosed 'wherein said saving means saves the browsed

data when the browsing is operated to move to another URL' [col 4, line 21-22].

41.   As to claim 30, Barrera disclosed 'setting means for setting not to save the

browsed data in a URL specified by the user' [col 4, line 17-20].

42.   As to claim 31, Barrera disclosed 'index extracting means for extracting as an

index a specific data from a data train constituting address of the browsed data in the

network on the basis of a predetermined rule' [col 4, line 59-62], specific data

corresponds to selected category.

43.   As to claim 32, Barrera disclosed 'specific data is a domain name' [col 1, line 39-40, col 2, line 25-26, col 4, line 21-22], domain names are used in URLs to identify particular Web pages, for example, in the URL<http:// www.yahoo.com> as detailed in col 1, line 39-40.

44.   As to claim 33,35, Barrera disclosed 'wherein the predetermined rule is a rule for eliminating a parameter, a protocol, an obvious address, and page data from the data train, and extracting a domain name from the reset of the data with referring to a knowledge base of domain names' [col 1, line 39-48].

45.   As to claim 34, Barrera disclosed 'wherein the specific data is a name of organization' [col 2, line 25-26].

46.   As to claim 36, Barrera disclosed 'predetermined rule includes a rule for dividing the rest of the data into partial data with a predetermined symbol and determining each of the partial data as an organization name' [col 2, line 25-32].

47.   As to claim 37, Barrera disclosed 'sending the acquired web page data or a specific part thereof to a destination' [fig 5, col 3, line 52-54].

48.   As to claim 38, Barrera disclosed 'specific part is a URL of the saved data' [col 4, line 22-23].

49.   As to claim 39, Barrera disclosed 'specific part is the saved data except for an

embedded image' [col 1, line 16-17].

50.   As to claim 61, Barrera disclosed 'index is dynamically generated' [col 5, line 17-

19].

51.   As to claim 63, Barrera disclosed 'retrieving data from said database based on a

user-supplied index' [col 4, line 59-62,col 5, line 25-29].

52.   As to claim 69, Barrera disclosed 'sending the acquired data to a predetermined

destination' [col 4, line 10-12, line 62-65].

53.   As to claim 78, Barrera disclosed 'indexing means displays the extracted

keyword or the title acquired from the browser' [fig 9, col 5, line 6-11].

54.   As to claim 79, Barrera disclosed 'index includes a time when the data is saved,

said system further comprising: node creation means for creating nodes corresponding

to groups classified on the basis of the timing of saving, said node creation means

crease a hierarchy of nodes col 4, line 56-59] by dividing a group corresponding to a

period into a plurality of sub group each corresponding to a shorter period and creating

a node corresponding to each of sub group' [col 5, line 1-4]]; 'node displaying means for

displaying a plurality of nodes created by said node creation means in an order of

saving' [col 5, line 4-6].

55.   As to claims 94,97, Barrera disclosed 'receiving means for receiving an index'

[col 4, line 58-59]; 'search means for searching the storage unit for web page stored in

correspondence with the same index as the received index' [col 4, line 62-65].

56.   As to claim 96,99, Barrera disclosed 'save instruction receiving means for

receiving save instruction from a user, wherein said indexing means assigns the index

to the web page data and said saving means saves the web page daa if the save

instruction is received' [col 5, line 17-19].

57.   As to claims 100-103, Barrer disclosed 'generating means for generating the first

index [fig 1, col 1, line 49-56] which is other than data extracted from the acquired web

page [col 4, line 57-62].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed
> or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the
> subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject
> matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made
> to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was
> made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of

the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g)

prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

58.   ***Claims 40-50,52-57,75-77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being***

unpatentable over Barrera et al. [hereafter Barrera], US Patent No. 6567800 filed

on Oct 1, 1998 and published on May 20,2003, Cole et al, [hereafter Cole], US

Patent No. 5933827 published on Aug 3, 1999 as applied to claims 1,59,60,93

above, further in view of Sidana, US Patent No. 6081829 filed on Jan 31, 1996, and

published on Jun 27,2000.

59.   As to claim 40,75, Barrera teaches website content is retrieved through a

network for example as detailed in fig 1-3. It is however, noted that Barrera, Cole do not

specifically teach 'editing the browsed data'. On the other hand, Sidana disclosed

'editing the browsed data' [col 6, line 36-44, fig 5].

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time

of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Sidana into searching information

stored on a network, particularly searching websites that use category information of

Barrera et al. , system for identifying new web pages of interest to a user of Cole et al.

because Barrera, Cole Sidana are directed to searching internet, more specifically

browsing web documents [see Barrera: col 4, line 56-62; Cole: Abstract, fig 4a-b,

Sidana: col 1, 58-62], further, Barrera, Cole, Sidana specifically teach displaying web

page [Barrera: fig 7; Cole, fig 4a-b, Sidana: fig 7] and they all are directed to internet

searching.

One of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to

incorporate the teachings of Sidana into searching information stored on a network,

particularly searching websites that use category information of Barrera et al. , and

identifying new web pages of interest to a user of Cole et al.because that would have

allowed users of Barrera, Cole to modify the document and return the modified

document for viewing by the user, more specifically, user can edit/modify the web

document to write comments or annotations to the original we-viewable document

[see Abstract, fig 7, col 2, line 22-33], further allows users of Barrera, Cole to store

redirected web document information because redirects allowing the user to view both

his own annotations and departmental annotations from the original web document

[see Sadana: col 3, line 10-18], thus bringing the advantages of enable a user browsing

the web to store information associated with a web document, without the necessity of

modifying HTTP protocols, the browser software and/or the server software

60.   As to claim 41, 76, Sadana disclosed 'editing means includes annotation means

for adding an annotation to the browsed data' [col 2, line 16-21,fig 7].

61.   As to claim 42, Sadana disclosed 'wherein said annotation means adds an

annotation in such a manner that the annotation is distinguishable from the browsed

data' [col 4, line 57-67, fig 7-8].

62.   As to claim 43, Sadana disclosed 'wherein said editing means includes changing

means for changing a display form of a designated portion in the browsed data' [col 5,

line 58-67, fig 4].

63.   As to claim 44, 77, Sadana disclosed 'extraction means for extracting a

predetermined type of data from the browsed data' [col 5, line 40-45];

'extracted data saving means for saving the extracted data in the database'

[col 5, line 32-35].

64.   As to claim 45, Sadana disclosed 'extraction means extracts data in a

predetermined column in response to a copying operation of data from a specified

portion of the browsed data to the predetermined column' [col 7, line 1-6, fig 6a], and

said extracted data saving means saves the extracted data with an attribute

corresponding to the predetermined column'[col 7, line 7-9, fig 6a-b]

65.   As to claim 46, Sadana disclosed 'predetermined type of data includes at least

one of an organization name, a person name, an E-mail address, a telephone number,

a Fax number and a keyword appended to the data' [col 9, line 37-41, line 41-45, col 10,

line 39-40].

66.   As to claim 47, Sadana disclosed 'wherein if the data requested to be saved

includes data from other URL identified in the web page data, said data acquisition

means downloads the included data from the other URL' [col 7, line 65-67, col 8,

line 1-4].

67.   As to claim 48, Sadana disclosed 'wherein if the data from the other URL is

already available in the storage unit, said data acquisition means dispenses with the

downloading of the data'[col 8, line 5-8].

68.   As to claim 49, Sadana disclosed 'mode selection means for selecting an

automatic save mode, and in the automatic save mode, said determination means

determines the condition to be satisfied to save the browsed data every time a new web

page is browsed' [fig 4, col 5, line 58-62].

69.   As to claim 50, Sadana disclosed 'wherein said data acquisition means, said

determination means, said indexing means, said saving means, and said database are

equipped in a server apparatus,[fig 2, col 5, line 8-15] and said system further

comprising at least one client apparatus connected to said server apparatus, each of

said client apparatus transmits a user request to said server apparatus and receives a

response to the user request from said server apparatus' [col 5, line 15-19, fig 2].

70.   As to claim 52-53, Sadana disclosed 'a local database' [col 4, line 20-21], 'a web

information storage device for storing web information acquired from an internet' [col 4,

line 17-19]; 'administration means for administrating data in either of said database, said

local database, and said web information storage device' [col 4, line 31-36].

71.   As to claim 54-57, Sadana disclosed database is equipped in a server apparatus

[see fig 1-2], and said data acquisition means, said determination means, said indexing

means, and said saving means are equipped in at least one client apparatus connected

to said server apparatus' [col 10, line 4-12].

72.   *Claims 9-10,12,72-73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being*

unpatentable over Barrera et al. [hereafter Barrera], US Patent No. 6567800 filed

on Oct 1, 1998 and published on May 20,2003, Cole et al, [hereafter Cole], US

Patent No. 5933827 published on Aug 3, 1999 as applied to claims 1,59,60,93

above, further in view of Walls et al, [hereafter Walls] US Patent No. 5848410 filed

on Oct 8,1997, and published on Dec 8,1998.

73.   As to claim 9-10,12, 72-73, Although Barrera, Cole specifically teaches user uses

key word search and selects respective web pages and building records of categories of

the data from web pages [Barrera: col 4, line 57-65; Cole: col 4, line 18-23, fig 4(a-b],

Barrer, Cole do not specifically teach 'folder creation means for creating a new folder;

'file name assigning means for assigning a predetermined name to the newly

browsed data without intervention by a user' [col 8, line 60-65]

'file saving means for saving the newly browsed data in the new folder with the

assigned file name'. On the other hand, Walls specifically teaches folder creation

means for creating a new folder [col 8, line 50-55];

'file name assigning means for assigning a predetermined name to the newly

browsed data without intervention by a user' [col 9, line 3-9]

'file saving means for saving the newly browsed data in the new folder with the

assigned file name' [fig 2-3,col 12, line 13-22].

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time

of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Walls et al. into searching

information stored on a network, particularly searching websites that use category

information of Barrera et al. , system for identifying new web pages of interest to a user

of Cole et al. because Barrera, Cole Walls are directed to searching internet, more

specifically browsing web documents [see Barrera: col 4, line 56-62; Cole: Abstract, fig

4a-b, Walls: fig 9], further, Barrera, Cole, Walls specifically teach displaying web page

[Barrera: fig 7; Cole, fig 4a-b, Walls: fig 9-12] and they all are directed to internet

searching.

One of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to

incorporate the teachings of Walls into searching information stored on a network,

particularly searching websites that use category information of Barrera et al. , and

identifying new web pages of interest to a user of Cole et al.because that would have

allowed users of Barrera, Cole to save browsed data into specific folders and files in a

alphabetical index order, ie., index-organizing elements that characterize subjects of the

information and corresponding files and folders there by eliminating the need

periodically to repeat a search to ensure that changes in information of the one or more

files are considered by the user as suggested by Walls [col 3, line 60-63

Response to Arguments

74.   Applicant's arguments filed on 3/12/2007 with respect to pending claims *1,4,6-
10,12-15,18-21,26-50,52-57,59-61,63-64,66-67,69,72-73,75-79,93-94,96-97,99-103*
have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive, for examiner's response, see

discussion below:

a)   At page 23, claims 1,59,60,93, applicant argues that Barrera does not appear to

disclose or suggest any extracting of a keyword from the content of the acquired web

page data.....

As to the above argument [a], as best understood by the examiner, Barrera is

directed to searching websites that use category information, more specifically, ,

Barrera specifically teaches extracting textual content, from the web page or website

particularly content is correlated with a category i.e., keywords as detailed in [col 4,

line 26-30, line 56-62].

b)   At page 24, claims 1,59,60,93, applicant argues that Barrer does not appear to

disclose or suggest among other things saving of web page data in correspondence

with the assigned indicies....

As to the argument [b], as best understood by the examiner, Barrera suggests

organizing webpages in number of categories , particularly, categories are listed for

example search by subject that corresponds to indexing information related to keywords

from the webpages, further Barrera also suggests dynamic index is stored, that

including list of web pages or URLs as detailed in col 5, line 17-19, further it is noted

that website content is not only retrieved through the network, but also stored or saved

in relation with the category because when user searches specific selected category ,

content is retrieved from the stored website content as detailed in col 4, line 56-65]

c)   At page 24, applicant argues that Barrera is also believed to be silent as to .....for

example dependent claim 9 further recites crating a new folder.....

d)   At page 24, claim 12, applicant argues that Barrera is silent on generating a

unique file name to be assigned as ....

As to the argument [c-d], Although Barrera, Cole specifically teaches user uses

key word search and selects respective web pages and building records of categories of

the data from web pages [Barrera: col 4, line 57-65; Cole: col 4, line 18-23, fig 4(a-b],

Barrer, Cole do not specifically teach 'folder creation means for creating a new folder.

On the other hand, Walls specifically teaches creating files and folders particularly

creating in a alphabetical index by keywords [see Abstract, fig 2-3,col 12, line 13-22].

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time

of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Walls et al. into searching

information stored on a network, particularly searching websites that use category

information of Barrera et al. , system for identifying new web pages of interest to a user

of Cole et al. because Barrera, Cole Walls are directed to searching internet, more

specifically browsing web documents [see Barrera: col 4, line 56-62; Cole: Abstract,

fig 4a-b, Walls: fig 9], further, Barrera, Cole, Walls specifically teach displaying web

page [Barrera: fig 7; Cole, fig 4a-b, Walls: fig 9-12] and they all are directed to internet

searching.

One of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to

incorporate the teachings of Walls into searching information stored on a network,

particularly searching websites that use category information of Barrera et al. , and

identifying new web pages of interest to a user of Cole et al.because that would have

allowed users of Barrera, Cole to save browsed data into specific folders and files in a

alphabetical index order, ie., index-organizing elements that characterize subjects of the

information and corresponding files and folders there by eliminating the need

periodically to repeat a search to ensure that changes in information of the one or more

files are considered by the user as suggested by Walls [col 3, line 60-63

Conclusion

The prior art made of record

a.	US Patent No.	6567800
b.	US Patent No.	6081829
c	US Patent No.	5933827
d.	US Patent No.	5848410

75.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Srirama Channavajjala whose telephone number is 571-272-4108. The examiner can normally be reached on   Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alam, Hosain, T, can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone numbers for the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300 Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free)

sc
Patent Examiner.
April 30, 2007.

SRIRAMA CHANNAVAJJALA
PRIMARY EXAMINER